On Vietnam: We Need Those Lie Detectors at Home, P. 3

Why The Pope Kept Silent—From the State Dept's Diplomatic Records

"Mr. Harold H. Tittman, Ass't to the President's Personal Representative to Pope Pius XII, to the Secretary of State."

"The Holy See is still apparently convinced that a forthright denunciation by the Pope of Nazi atrocities, at least in so far as Poland is concerned, would only result in the violent deaths of more people. Mgr. Montini [then Papal Under Secretary of State, now Pope Paul VI] however stated to me that the time may come when, in spite of such a grievous prospect, the Holy Father will feel himself obliged to speak out. . . . Another motive, possibly the controlling one, behind the Pope's disinclination to denounce Nazi atrocities is his fear that if he does so now, the German people, in the bitterness of their defeat, will reproach him later on for having contributed, if only indirectly, to this defeat. It has been pointed out to me that just such an accusation was directed against the Holy See by the Germans after the last war, because of certain phrases spoken and attitudes adopted by Benedict XV while hostilities were in progress. When it is borne in mind that Pius XII had many years of conditioning in Germany,* it will not seem unnatural that he should be particularly sensible to this particular argument. Vatican City, Oct. 6, 1942."

—Pps. 776-7, Foreign Relations, 1942, Vol. III, published 1952, one of several documents which show U.S. Allied and neutral efforts to inform the Vatican about the "death factories" and to elicit some protest.

*** "Pius XII, as Nuncio to Germany, had been assured by the German Catholic aristocracy that Hitler would 'end the peril of Bolshevism'. . . . Not even the murder of the Catholic Action leader, Klausener in 1934, was sufficient to disillusion him. He even showed mild disapproval of the Papal Encyclical of March 14, 1937, in which Pius XI accused Hitler of breaking faith with the concordat, and on the day of his coronation, on March 12, 1939, urged 'patience and moderation' in the Vatican's dealings with Hitler."**

—The Day of The Lion: The Rise and Fall of Fascist Italy, by Roy MacGregor Hastie (Coward-McCann) just published.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XII, NO. 10 MARCH 9, 1964 101 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

What Some People Have Forgotten About God's "Deputy"

One of the elements missing in Rolf Hochhuth's play "The Deputy" and in comment upon it is recognition of the crucial role played by the Vatican in the rise of Fascism. The Vatican opposed modern liberalism from its very inception. It denounced Marxism, whether democratic or totalitarian. But everywhere it welcomed Fascism—in Italy, in Germany, in Spain, in Austria, in Slovakia and in Hungary. Many commentators have contrasted Pius XII, the central figure in Hochhuth's play, with his predecessor, Pius XI. But Pius XII, in being friendly to Hitler, was only following in the footsteps of Pius XI. Mussolini's seizure of power in Italy could have been blocked if the powerful Catholic Popular Party, and its priestly leader, Don Luigi Sturzo, had been allowed to follow the policy now being applied by Italy's Christian Democrats. An "opening to the left" which united the Popular Party with the Socialists and the Liberals against *Fascismo,* would have choked off this pestilence at the start.

Twin Pacts With The Devil

But Pius XI decided otherwise. He disliked Don Luigi and his party, which had won a following among the peasantry by its advocacy of land reform. He joined the industrialists and the army officers who, like their counterparts a decade later in Germany, saw Fascism as a protection for property rights against the clamor for social reform. The Popular Party was dissolved and Don Luigi driven into exile. In Italy, as in Germany, Catholic anti-Fascists were sacrificed for a concordant with the dictatorships. These pacts with the devil lent first Il Duce and then Der Fuehrer a cloak of Catholic approval when they most needed it. The March on Rome which Pius XI facilitated was the first step toward Auschwitz which Pius XII never condemned. The louts and paranoids Mussolini marshalled for his coup were the same type who later stoked the human furnaces for Hitler with Jews, gypsies and Slavs too weak to work for Krupp and I. G. Farben. More than the sin of silence lies on the consciences of God's "deputies." They were accessories in the creation of these criminal regimes.

Christian Anti-Nazis Abandoned, Too

"Clergy and laymen, priests and men of political life, who ventured to think and practice resistance, could count on the sympathy of their church leaders, neither in prison nor on the scaffold."

—Friedrich Heer, German Catholic historian, in his book, Die Deutschen, der Nationalsozialismus und die Gegenwart, *quoted by Rolf Hochhuth in the appendix to his play* The Deputy, *p. 305 (Grove Press).*

A second element has to do with Allied policy. While the Allies were pressing Pius XII to condemn Nazi atrocities against the Jews for its propaganda value, they were far from whole-hearted about saving the victims. I remember as a young newspaperman the coldness one encountered in the State Department on the subject of refugees and the inhumanity with which the British turned away from Palestine boatloads of Jews fleeing from Hitler's ovens; two, the Struma and the Patria, sank with their human cargoes. Last October 12, the State Department released a volume of diplomatic papers from the year 1943 (Vol. I: General) in which two painful stories are disclosed. One (at p. 134) is a British Embassy memorandum expressing fear lest the Germans "change over from the policy of extermination to one of extrusion, and aim as they did before the war at embarrassing

(Continued on Page Four)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Peace" Senators Limit Selves to Defense of McNamara Against Bomber Lobby

Few Speak and None Vote "No" As Congress Rubber Stamps Huge Arms Bill

Not a single member of Congress voted against the $17 billion weapons procurement authorization bill for 1965. It passed House and Senate last week after five hours debate in which only a handful participated. Attacking Secretary McNamara's cost-effectiveness program apparently required the privileged sanctuary of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, which offered plans for cutting the bill $1 billion and $1.4 billion respectively.

Nelson's Lone Protest

The small group of pro-disarmament Senators confined themselves this year to the safe position of defending the Secretary of Defense against the aviation lobby. But Sen. McGovern suggested he "may have some amendments" to the appropriation bill. Genuine dissent was limited to Senator Nelson's (D. Wis) eloquent protest against rubber-stamping the largest procurement bill ever when there is now no question about the capacity of both the United States and the Soviet Union for mutual destruction. Protesting that testimony on the bill had not even been printed before the debate, he questioned "what is apparently an established tradition—perhaps a national attitude—which holds that a bill to spend billions for the machinery of war must be rushed through the House and Senate in a matter of hours, while a treaty to advance the cause of peace, or a bill to guarantee the rights of all our citizens must be . . . thrashed over for weeks and perhaps months."

Debate in both Houses over whether to authorize an unrequested $52 million for bomber research revealed a new approach to defense spending which would maintain high budgets despite Rep. Vinson's statement that "we are coming up pretty close to our total needs." This would have us build weapon systems which have no rational purpose other than to force the Soviets to divert their more limited resources into building defensive counterparts. Thus Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee Russell said, "If we eliminate the bomber and let the Russians devote all their resources to defend against missiles, they are sure to develop such a defense more rapidly than they would if they had to prepare two defensive systems . . . (whereas) we can afford to develop the two weapon systems and, at the same time, work on defenses against theirs." The U.S. at Geneva is trying to sell the idea of a bonfire for obsolete bombers. If the aviation lobby has its way, there will be plenty to burn.

Four Anti-Militarist Films

It is a pleasure to report that four—no less—films are now playing in Washington which attack the military and militarism. We recommend each of them highly. One is a savage satire on the nuclear age, "Dr. Strangelove, or How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb." Stanley Kubrick deserves a Nobel prize for it. The second is the superbly played "Seven Days in May"—the gifted Rod Serling has made a first rate movie script of a second rate book. Civics teachers anxious to explain the meaning of civilian supremacy in the U.S. Constitution could make no firmer impression than to take their classes to this movie. The third is "The Man in The Middle," the story of an attempt by the high brass to fix a court martial. The fourth is "The Victors" a film by Carl Foreman worthy to stand beside his "High Noon." Its final scene, a drunken knife fight between a U.S. and Soviet soldier in the ruins of Berlin is symbolic of the poisonous and suicidal cold war brewed by the Germans in the moment of their defeat. P.S. for Soviet readers: Paste this item on a postcard and send it to Marshal Malinovsky who, like the Pentagon, has been objecting to anti-war and anti-militarist literature and films. Capitalist or Communist, brass hats are alike.

The Games Our Military Play with Congress at Budget Time

"This amendment will be aimed at that part of the Navy procurement called the VAL aircraft. You will find the VAL explained on page 11 of the committee report. Anyone with the temerity to point out that the three-line explanation there comes to about $60 million a line will be met with the argument that the details are secret. To those of you who may feel slighted, I want to say to you that you are not missing a thing. I want to assure you further that the more you study this particular procurement the more firmly you will be convinced of the need for secrecy, not to protect the details of the program from the terrible Communists, but to keep the details from our taxpaying constituents.

"The VAL is a new attack aircraft for the Navy. The Navy called it a modification of an existing aircraft. It was just a tiny little modification—consisting of a new engine, fuselage, wings and avionics. If this can be done by reprogramming, the Navy can reprogram a barge into a battleship or a carrier into a catamaran.

"Why did they do it by reprogramming? Because, they said time was of the essence. So important was time that they waited from November until February before announcing that this little old $2 billion program was heading deep into the heart of Dallas. Everyone in the aircraft industry knew it was heading for Dallas back in December, but the Navy played games with Congress.

"[Now] to the merits of this aircraft. Today the Navy is producing one interceptor and preparing to produce another, but [it says] it needs a new attack plane [VAL]. The Air Force is producing one attack plane [A-6A] and preparing to produce another. And one amazing thing about it all is that the interceptor the Navy is producing and the attack plane the Air Force is now producing are the same plane. Another amazing thing is that the TFX which the Navy calls an interceptor and the F-111 which the Air Force calls an attack plane will also be the same plane.

"The VAL is designed to keep some production lines which were to close down this summer in operation. What will this magnificent new aircraft do? I quote from Admiral Thach, page 7319 of the hearings:

"QUESTION: Can you tell me any mission which your new VAL can accomplish that the A-6A cannot?

"Admiral THACH: No, sir.

"QUESTION: Is it not also true that the A-6A can accomplish a great many missions which the VAL cannot?

"Admiral THACH: That is also true, sir.

"This is a brand new $2 billion program, illegitimately conceived and dedicated to the proposition that the Members of Congress will vote for any military program because they would rather be called soft in the head than soft on communism."

—Rep. Pike (D. N.Y.), defense debate, Feb. 20 (abridged)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We Need Those Lie Detectors In Washington More Than in Saigon

The Most Hopeful News of the Week: LBJ (and Russell) on Civil Rights

The most encouraging news of the week was President Johnson's forthright endorsement at press conference of the civil rights bill as passed by the House and the defeatist tone of Senator Russell's appearance on CBS "Face The Nation" next day. Russell's admission that Johnson can nevertheless carry Georgia and his complaint that "brain-washing" has brought about increased support for civil rights in his State indicate that while the white supremacist Old Guard may not surrender it knows itself defeated.

The President's press conference, the first of its kind in his career as a political leader, went off well and should cure him of his nervousness about facing the press. His English was good (we were guilty of unfairness and intellectual snobbery a few weeks back in a slighting smart-aleck reference to his prose style). His conciliatory remarks about Panama, his tamping down of alarmist speculation about Vietnam and his remarks about world peace were encouraging.

Less Hopeful Indicators

One could breathe more easily, however, if it were not for less hopeful indicators behind the scenes. It was the White House itself which stimulated press reports that an extension of the war to North Vietnam was under contemplation. Johnson's hand-picked coordinator for Latin affairs, Tom Mann, in private speaks a very different language from that which the President used at press conference about Panama. Mann expresses "tough guy" views more suitable to the era of "dollar diplomacy" than to contemporary Latin America. He is arrogant and simple-minded—the kind of American diplomat who feeds stereotypes about Yanqui Imperialism. So will Johnson if he lets the Commerce Department go through with the plan to interfere with lard shipments to Cuba. We have made a big show of humanitarianism in exempting food and medicine hitherto from our embargo.

At his press conference, as in almost every speech he has made, Mr. Johnson emphasized the awful power a President now has to "destroy 100 million people in a matter of minutes" and added "our opponents can do likewise." He said simply, "I don't think the people of the world want that to happen and I think we are going to do everything that we can to avoid its happening." * But a recognition of the brink on which mankind stands requires more than caution in our bipolar relations with Moscow. It also requires a new flexibility and a new magnanimity in areas where we continue to impose suffering on native populations (as in Vietnam and Cuba in frustrated stubborness.

Almost as an afterthought, in his press conference of February 27, Secretary of State Rusk let slip the truth about Vietnam when he said "no miracle in the North is going to suddenly transform or eliminate the problem in South Vietnam." But if the war in South Vietnam is simply a case of aggression from the North, an effort to impose Communism on a helpless people "struggling for its freedom" (our official mythology), then of course a miraculous shift in the North *would* solve the problem. Rusk's remark implies that the problem is local, deep-seated and not to be solved from outside. This contradicts all that he and McNamara and the White House have been saying about the war for three years. There are reports from Saigon that we are going to use lie detectors on the prisoners we capture there. A pity we cannot use those lie detectors on our own top officials at home. Do they really believe what they continue to tell us?

The Phantoms That Bedevil Peace

"New Communist advances in Laos that brought a strong U.S. protest on Friday, were touched on only briefly in the news conference. . . . Informed sources, however, said nothing very encouraging about Laos came out of talks held in Moscow Friday between Ambassador Kohler and Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko."

—Washington Post Mar. 1 on Johnson press conference

"Vietiane, Laos, Feb. 29 — A neutralist military spokesman said today that a neutralist reconnaissance company dispatched to Phou Khe Mt. found no trace of reported units of Pathet Lao or North Viet Minh. . . . It was on the basis of these reports that the U.S. charged on Friday that the Communists had committed a 'flagrant' violation of Laotian neutrality."

—Same paper, same day, same page

"A right-wing military spokesman said Thursday . . . that six North Vietnamese battalions had taken part in the assault, though most military observers here were skeptical of the report. . . . Neutralist officers have been critical lately of what they consider highly exaggerated right wing reports of North Vietnamese participation in Laotian fighting. They have also indicated a belief that the right wing troops had fled their positions at Phou Khe before any infantry assault had been launched."

—New York Times from Vietiane, same day.

*** It is indicative that it was a Polish reporter, the able Zygmunt Broniarek of Trybuna Ludu who elicited this statement from the President and that the U.S. press paid so little attention to the answer.**

The Senate's Clearest Voice for Common Sense in Vietnam

"It is apparently France's purpose to work for a diplomatic rather than a military solution to the problems of the peninsula once known as Indochina . . . we should not spurn the participation. France has advantages here we do not have. Language, culture, and capital are hers. She could make good use of these advantages. . . . Our policy should be flexible enough to allow, even to encourage such exploration.

"Our policies need reevaluation, and central to this reevaluation is the defusing of Red China as a domestic policy issue. We must be able to discuss Red China as we discuss other nations, Communist or free.

"France is now attempting to draw the Chinese Communists to something closer to normal diplomatic relations. If this serves to better the exchange of information on attitudes and policy, then this will be to the benefit of all. . . . If we are to have anything like a peaceful resolution of southeast Asia, China must be party to the resolution."

—Bartlett (D. Alaska) in the Senate, Feb. 19.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Apparently Some British Officials Feared Too Many Jews Might Be Saved

(Continued from Page One)

other countries by flooding them with alien immigrants." Milton Friedman of *Jewish Telegraphic Agency*, the only Washington correspondent who paid attention to these documents, commented "It would appear the concern existed 20 years ago in some high places that too many Jews might escape from Hitler and burden the democracies with their presence."

Neither Jewish Gospel Helped

His Majesty's Government in the same memorandum said it was ready to take 4500 Jewish children and 300 women from Bulgaria but could not accept adult males from enemy occupied countries in Palestine owing to "the acute security problem" and the White Paper of 1939, which severely restricted Jewish immigration to the Holy Land lest this antagonize the Arabs. The British were not alone in this kind of thinking. The same volume at p. 296 contains a memorandum from the U.S. Chiefs of Staff objecting to a plan to move 4500 refugees from Spain to camps in North Africa lest this "cause resentment on the part of the Arab population." From a Jewish point of view, it was not the Pope alone who failed the test of conscience. Neither the Gospel of Jesus nor the Gospel of Marx prevented their highest respective spokesmen from making pacts with Hitler. In all the great capitals, political expedience came before humanity. The whole bitter story still feeds Jewish nationalism. When our people were thrown to the furnaces, few really cared.

It helps to heal our hearts that a young German should have written "The Deputy." It is also a good sign that the play should have aroused such animosity—like a painful memory dragged unwillingly from the subconscious of a whole generation. The protest and the shame indicate that under the hypocrisy and the cant there lives on a concern for human and moral values. The crematoriums should not be forgotten. That one set of human beings could do this to another set condemns our whole species. There are savages within us against whom we must be on guard. The excuses of race and statecraft that are used to justify murder, and silence about it, now threaten the entire human race with a "final solution."

This Alone Will Posterity Remember

"It could harshly be said: It was not the highest duty of the Pope to rescue Jews. The Pope can't save everybody. But it was his duty to keep Christendom in a literal sense from going to the devil: that in the middle of his West, Christians should do Satan's work, with which not only Germany but all Christendom will be forever stained. Posterity will over and over again look at this Pope and wonder about his silence. . . . Just as one can already see that of the whole history of Hitler and the Second World War, only two words will remain in the memory of mankind—Auschwitz and Hiroshima —so one also feels that of Pius XII there will survive only the memory of his silence."

—Sebastion Haffner, writing of The Deputy *in the German illustrated weekly,* Stern, *April 7, 1963, quoted at p. 235 of* Summa Iniuria oder Durfte der Papst Schweigen? *(Rowohlt) a collection of German articles about Hochhuth's play.*

For the play as presented in New York, Herman Shumlin deserves a high mark for courage, a lesser one for artistry. His version is an oversimplified and sometimes vulgarized shadow of the original. Gerstein, Jacobson and Fontana are all debased from Hochhuth's original conception. In the original, the SS man, Gerstein, who tried to help the Jews, was not a hysteric. Jacobson, the Jew hiding out in his apartment, was not the vulgar creature in Jerome Rothenberg's adaptation. Fontana, the young Jesuit who goes to Auschwitz in protest, is also diminished in the New York version. But Emlyn Williams is magnificent as the Pope. Severely shortened, the play as produced also focuses too narrowly on the moral responsibility of the Pope while Hochhuth's original brings the German people into the full orbit of guilt. But to see the play is still an experience we recommend as a moral and political duty, though the play in book form (excellently translated by Richard and Clara Winston for Grove Press) is essential to grasp the author's full design and memorable intention. It is Hochhuth's achievement so painfully to have twisted the conscience of the Church and the world.

Free Sample Copies Still Available of Matthews and MLF Issues If You Send Envelopes But Please Specify Which Issue—or Both

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

3/9/642

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

Newspaper

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED